

United Nations and the free world by his continued acts of avoiding United Nations inspections. He played a game of cat and mouse. Just when he thought we were developing the courage—the United Nations and others—to take him to task, he would relent temporarily only to kick the inspectors out and continue to defy the United Nations inspections.

My final point is there are some, including the Senator from Massachusetts, who have called the war in Iraq “another Vietnam.” The Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, I think did as good a job as possibly could have been done—certainly a person who has enormous credibility on that issue, having served so ably in Vietnam and, unfortunately, having been a prisoner of war there for a time—I think he did a very good job of refuting that and really showing the truth about that sort of scurrilous accusation. It is the kind of speech I worry has the possibility of a tremendously negative effect on our war on terror.

Our enemies should not be confused about our commitment to follow through, win the war on terror and crush our enemies in the process.

I grew up during the course of the Vietnam war. I remember what it was like in this country when our men and women in the field returned to this country only to find the American people did not support them as they should have and where America lost its resolve and strength of will. We should never let that happen again. It was a terrible American tragedy. For anyone to suggest that America is going to suffer loss of will or resolve in winning this war on terror is simply wrong.

I think we should not be fooled into thinking when Senators or any government official or anyone stands up and equates what is happening in Iraq and what is happening in Afghanistan and what is happening generally in the war on terror with Vietnam—they are providing fodder for our enemies. They are encouraging our enemies to think that perhaps we will lose our resolve and give rise to, I think, increased attacks against our troops on the ground and undermining our war effort generally.

I certainly don't suppose anyone is doing that intentionally. But I think we need to be careful about the words we use.

I know a short time remains in our morning business. I see the distinguished majority whip on the floor.

I would say in closing that words are important. Words have meaning. The words that are said today won't be remembered just in the context of election year and partisan politics; they will stand in history for future generations to read and study with a critical eye. In the end, we must focus on the battle with our common foe and not on each other.

I yield the floor.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, on our side we have 40 minutes, with the first 15 minutes yielded to the Senator from Connecticut and the second 15 minutes to the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS. My counterpart is in the Chamber and wishes to speak. The Republicans have the first division of time this morning. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. MCCONNELL. How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes eleven seconds on the Republican side.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I am not certain I can finish in 5 minutes. I wonder if it would be all right with the other side to have 10 minutes instead of 5.

Mr. REID. No objection. That would be yielded on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### TERRORISM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, there is no question the terrorists are at war with us. Unfortunately, it is becoming increasingly apparent in Washington we are at war with each other.

The September 11 Commission is holding hearings right now. It has an admirable goal of investigating the reasons that our immigration, intelligence, law enforcement, military, and legal systems failed to prevent 19 Islamic radicals from hijacking planes and using them as weapons of terror so we can prevent such lapses in the future.

Already the Bush administration and Congress have acted to reform numerous agencies and procedures to deter and to prevent future terrorist attacks on our country. What have we done? We have responded to terrorism vigorously by attacking the terrorists where they live and confronting the regimes that support them, rather than by lobbing a few cruise missiles at an empty desert tent.

We created the Department of Homeland Security to put all domestic security agencies under one roof. We overwhelmingly passed the USA PATRIOT Act which provides law enforcement agencies the tools they need to monitor, apprehend, and convict terrorists. We have cracked down on terrorists' financing at home and abroad by shuttering sham charities that fund terror and by freezing terrorists' assets. We have streamlined and reformed the intelligence agencies and are working to improve coordination among the many agencies responsible for protecting America.

Hopefully, the Commission will identify additional methods to improve U.S. security, but forgive me for not being terribly optimistic. I fear the Commission has lost sight of its goal and has become a political casualty of the electoral hunting season.

Sadly, the Commission's public hearings have allowed those with political

axes to grind, such as Richard Clarke, to play shamelessly to the partisan gallery of liberal special interests seeking to bring down the President. These special interest groups have undeniably exploited the Commission for political gain. Moveon.org, for example, the ultra liberal organization that opposed America's liberation of both Iraq and Afghanistan—Moveon.org opposed the liberation of Afghanistan as well as Iraq—is funding TV ads that use Clarke's voice to accuse President Bush of not doing enough to stop terrorism. Moveon.org will launch a \$200,000 ad campaign that restates this claim during CNN's coverage of Dr. Rice's testimony before the Commission this morning.

Clarke himself, publicly and under oath, has said he believes that even had the President implemented every single one of the suggestions he made to the President when he came into office, we would still not have been able to prevent the September 11 attacks. Let's take a look at that again. Mr. Clarke himself has said that even if President Bush had done everything he recommended to the President, we could not have prevented the September 11 attacks.

Before deciding to profit from his revisionist history, Clarke argues persuasively that President Bush's policy to combat terrorism was more aggressive than that of his predecessor. Clarke noted that President Bush expressed frustration with the previous policy of “swatting at flies” and that the President authorized a fivefold increase for covert operations against terrorists in Afghanistan.

The Washington blame game has distracted us from the important task at hand: Winning the war against the terrorists. The only entity responsible for September 11 was al-Qaida. We need a real debate in America about how to prosecute the war against terrorism because there are two fundamentally different schools of thought about how to win this war, two fundamentally different philosophies about how to win this war.

On the one hand, there are the President's critics who define terrorism so narrowly as to include only the terrorists directly responsible for September 11, and not the many other terrorist groups currently plotting attacks against America and her allies. They believe this war can be fought under the auspices of the U.N., if only America would yield to the French or the Russians or the Chinese. They are unwilling to act alone when others refuse to confront by force those who choose death over life and violence over peace.

On the other hand, there are those who believe that al-Qaida is merely one head of the hydra and that to kill the beast of terrorism you must drain the swamp in which the beast lives and the terrorists thrive. We have done that in Afghanistan, we are doing that in Iraq, and we must do it everywhere terrorism thrives.

Some critics, such as the junior Senator from Massachusetts, have argued that the war in Iraq is a distraction and that the global war on terrorism has actually been set back as a result of draining the swamp in Iraq. Senator KERRY's reversal on Iraq was wrong and his refusal to support \$87 billion for U.S. troops for reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan stands as a stark rebuttal to President John F. Kennedy's call to "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty."

This war is not an isolated fight against al-Qaida but a global competition with a shadowy evil that lurks on every continent. It is a fight against the very enemies of freedom. We must never ever shrink from that fight. Terrorists do not reside in Afghanistan alone. It would be dangerously irresponsible to focus single-mindedly on al-Qaida while neglecting the other real threats facing our Nation. There is no doubt that terrorists reside in Iraq. We see evidence of this fact every single day on television.

Those who claim that Iraq is a distraction in the war against terrorism have very short memories, conveniently short memories. They have already forgotten that the Clinton administration State Department listed Iraq as a state sponsor of terrorism—that is the Clinton administration: Iraq as a state sponsor of terrorism—and that Saddam Hussein provided safe haven to international terrorists. We all know he made cash payments to families of suicide bombers among Palestinians.

Now the terrorists are currently making a desperate stand to prevent the establishment of an oasis of freedom in the heart of the Middle East. If we fail to eradicate the terrorists in Iraq, we will fail to defeat terrorism anywhere.

Waffling on our commitment to Iraq would convince the terrorists that America is little more than a paper tiger, and it would undermine our global efforts to deter other rogue states, such as Iraq and North Korea, from supporting terrorism.

We must not allow Iraq to become another Somalia. Going home early is the surest way to embolden the terrorists and to ensure the failure of our efforts to bring peace and security to the Middle East.

It was said the other day that Iraq is Bush's Vietnam. Nothing could be further from the truth. It may be Japan or Germany or Korea, but it is not Vietnam. We face lingering threats and challenges in those conflicts, but by staying the course we heralded in decades of freedom and prosperity in places such as Japan, Germany, and Korea. That is what will be done in Iraq.

Victory in Iraq is now central to our war against terrorism, and not only because it is preferable to fighting terror-

ists in Iraq rather than in New York. A free Iraq represents a mortal blow to the terrorists' goal of a radicalized Middle East.

Until you change the politics of the Middle East, Islamic fundamentalists are going to keep trying to kill Americans, and not even the best defenses will be able to prevent every conceivable attack against us here at home.

Establishing a democratic and economic beachhead in the backyard of radical Islam is itself a major success in the war against terrorism. Indeed, that is precisely why foreign terrorists are so committed to preventing the Iraqis from building a democracy in the heart of the Middle East.

The war against terrorism must be fought outside of Afghanistan, and it must continue after bin Laden is dead or behind bars; otherwise, we will find ourselves as vulnerable as we were on September 10. We cannot keep America safe by distinguishing between terrorists who have attacked us and terrorists who want to attack us.

In conclusion, I close with a quote from Michael Kelly, who died a year ago in Iraq while covering the war from the tip of the spear as an embedded journalist with the Third Infantry Division. He wrote in February before our liberation of Iraq about our cause in Iraq and the challenges we would face. Here is what Michael Kelly had to say:

There is risk; and if things go terribly wrong it is a risk that could result in terrible suffering. But that is an equation that is present in any just war, and in this case any rational expectation has to consider the probable cost to humanity to be low and the probable benefit to be tremendous. To choose perpetuation of tyranny over rescue from tyranny, where rescue may be achieved, is immoral.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Nevada.

---

#### IRAQ

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would say I agree with my friend that the situation in Iraq is not a Vietnam. But it is Iraq. I would hope the comparisons made to Korea and Japan and Germany do not apply. We, of course, in Korea lost 55,000 troops there who died, with hundreds of thousands wounded and in Japan and Germany there were over half a million dead.

I agree with my friend from Kentucky that we have to do what we can to come out of the situation we have in Iraq. We certainly are there. We have to give our troops everything they need. They are under tremendous pressure. The situation there in the past week has been very difficult. We have to, as a Congress, do everything we can to let them know we support everything they are doing, and to make sure they have all the equipment and supplies they need to do the very best they are trained to do.

#### JOBS ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have worked very hard on this side of the aisle to pass S. 1637, which is the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to comply with World Trade Organization rulings, the so-called FSC bill. I want everyone to understand on our side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle that Senator DASCHLE made to the majority leader, last night, I think, a proposal that should have been accepted last night; that is, from the 75 amendments that have been proposed on our side, that has been reduced to approximately 20 amendments, with very short time agreements on the 20, nothing more than 30 minutes, and one amendment is for as little as 5 minutes.

I also suggest that if we look at what has happened with this piece of legislation, there has been nothing on our side that has been dilatory. We have wanted to move forward on this bill, but in the entire time we have worked on this bill we have voted once. If you go back to years past, when a tax bill comes before the Senate, it is not unusual to have more than 100 amendments offered and disposed of here in the Senate.

I think the good-faith offer made by the Democratic leader to the Republican leader is something that should be accepted. This is a proposal that would be good for the country, and it is in keeping with what we have tried to do on this piece of legislation—let the Senate act in accordance with the traditions of the Senate. It is a far cry from what we should have been doing this past 2 weeks. We could have worked our way through all of these amendments, but that has not been done.

I would suggest it would be in the best interests of the country that the offer made by the Democratic leader to the Republican leader be accepted at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2305 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 15 minutes.

---

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, in 2 weeks, this Nation will celebrate Earth Day. The first Earth Day was in 1970, 34 years ago. For three and a half decades, people from all walks of life have gathered on April 22 to celebrate the environment.

Since the first Earth Day, our Nation has had seven Presidents, including our current leader, President Bush. Four of the six former Presidents were Republicans: President Nixon, President